## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

CASE NO.: 3:14-CV-00178-RCJ-VPC

ORDER

8

9

10

11

LAUSTEVEION JOHNSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

12 N. YOUNG, et al.,

13 Defendant.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Before the Court is the Report and Recommendation of U.S. Magistrate Judge (#60 and 61<sup>1</sup>) entered on October 8-9, 2015, recommending that the Court deny Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF #38/56) and grant and deny in part Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF #36). On October 26, 2015 Plaintiff filed his Objections to Magistrates Report and Recommendation on Dispositive Motions (ECF #63). On October 26, 2015 Defendants filed a Limited Objection to Magistrate's Report and Recommendation (ECF#64). On November 9, 2015 Plaintiff filed his Response to Defendants Objection to Magistrate Report and Recommendation (ECF #65). On November 9, 2015 Defendants filed thier Opposition to Plaintiff's Objection to Magistrate's Report and Recommendation on Dispositive Motions (ECF #66).

The Court has conducted it's *de novo* review in this case, has fully considered the objections of the Plaintiff, the pleadings and memoranda of the parties and other relevant matters of record pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule IB 3-2. The Court determines that the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation (#60/61) entered on October 8-9, 2015, should be ADOPTED AND ACCEPTED.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Refers to court's docket number.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF #36) is GRANTED as to Plaintiff's First Amendment Retaliation Claim against Defendants Baker, Cox, and Moore; First Amendment Access to the Courts Claims; and Fourteenth Amendment Due Process Claims, but DENIED as to Plaintiff's First Amendment Retaliation Claim against Defendant Young. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF #38/56) is DENIED in its entirety. IT IS SO ORDERED this 18th day of November, 2015.